

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/US2006/033429

International filing date (day/month/year)
24.08.2006

Priority date (day/month/year)
12.09.2005

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
INV. G07F17/32

Applicant
IGT

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Date of completion of
this opinion

see form
PCT/ISA/210

Authorized Officer

Kling, Jonas

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-6045



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2006/033429

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - ☐ a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2006/033429

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-73
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-73
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-73
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A2-1 291 048

D2: EP-A2-1 231 577

2 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-73 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

2.1 Independent claim 1

The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

At a local gaming machine (cf. fig.1(12)), a method for providing a game of chance on a remote gaming machine (cf. fig.1(12)) in communication with the local gaming machine over a data network (cf. fig.1(14); [0011]), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a player input at an input terminal of the local gaming machine (cf. [0020] lines 19-22), the player input requesting a game application (cf. fig.3(310));

determining a location of the requested game application as being at the remote gaming machine (cf. [0011-0012]);

identifiing interface requirements of the requested game application (cf. [0016-0017]; fig.3(320);

determining whether the identified interface requirements are compatible with an interface of the local gaming machine (cf. [0018]; [0020]; fig.3(330)); and

reserving an instance of the requested game application on the remote gaming machine when it is determined that the interface requirements are compatible (cf. fig.3(340); [0020-0021]).

The subject-matter of claim 1 therefore differs from this known method in that:

- (i) the requested game application is executed on the remote gaming machine

The problem to be solved by the present invention may therefore be regarded as

- (p1) how to reduce the amount of data to be downloaded to the local terminal

The solution proposed in claim 1 of the present application cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons.

As already indicated in the application (description pages 1 and 2) and in the search report cited prior art (for example document D2, abstract; [0009]; [0018]) it is well known to have a server-based system where the game applications are executed on the central server and the outcome is transferred to the local gaming machine. A person skilled in the art confronted with the above problem (p1) would, without the use of inventive skill, use the well known feature of executing the game application on the game server (remote gaming machine).

- 2.2 The same reasoning applies, mutatis mutandis, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claims 30, 47, 55, 60, 72 and 73, which therefore are also considered not inventive.
- 3 Dependent claims 2-29, 31-46, 48-54, 56-59 and 61-71 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step, see documents D1, D2 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

- 4 Although claims 1, 30, 47, 55, 60, 72 and 73 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought and in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
- 5 Independent claims 1, 30, 47, 55, 60, 72 and 73 are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D1) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(I) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).
- 6 The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).